



COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

General Services Department Purchasing Division

701 OCEAN STREET, SUITE 330, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4073

ADDENDUM #1

Request for Proposal (RFP) 23P3-001

FOR

Software and Implementation Services for a HCM

Issued October 10, 2023

This addendum (#1) is being issued to correct an error in the Process Schedule, update Process Schedule dates, and answer questions posed by prospective vendors regarding RFP 23P3-001

In **Section 2.12b**, the Pre-Demonstration Web-Conference was listed as the week of 12/11/23. This has been updated per the updated RFP process schedule noted below and in the updated RFP document. Additional updated dates are highlighted in blue below.

RFP Process Schedule

a. The following is an anticipated RFP and engagement schedule. The County may change the estimated dates and process as deemed necessary.

The proposed schedule for the submittal reviews and notification is as follows:

Activity	Date
BOS Approval	09/12/23
Advertise RFP - Sentinel (2 dates, 1 week apart)	09/12/23 09/19/23
Release RFP	09/12/23
Optional Pre-Proposal Web Conference	09/27/23
Question Deadline	10/06/23
Dissemination of Answers	10/13/23
Deadline for Submittals	12/01/23
Shortlisted Vendors Notified	Week of 01/08/24
Pre-Demonstration Web-Conference	Week of 01/15/24
Vendor Demonstrations	Week of 02/05/24
Tentative Award	February 2024
Contract Negotiation	February-March 2024
Board Approval of Contract	April 2024

Vendor Questions

Vendor #1

Question: A question for you, as you are modernizing HCM, Next Generation Cloud ERP solutions like Oracle NetSuite for Government provide an integrated approach to ERP with Financials, Planning & Budgeting, HR and Payroll.

We cannot de-couple financials from HR/Payroll. Would you consider adding a next generation financials to go with your modern HCM?

Answer: The County is not considering doing this at this time.

Vendor #2

Question: Would you be willing to considering offering us an extension so we can fully respond to this RFP?

Answer: Please review the revised process schedule at the beginning of Amendment 1 for updated dates.

Vendor #3

Question: Would the County consider an extension to the response deadline due to the required physical/paper submission?

Answer: Please review the revised process schedule at the beginning of Amendment 1 for updated dates.

Question: We understand the need to replace current systems: SCCPayroll, eTimeCard, EZ Payroll, and Time Keep for HCM functions, but we wish to clarify that we read the RFP to mean the intention is retain Projects & Grants functionality imbedded within the FE system, as opposed to implementing a new budgeting/grants module or system. Is that accurate?

Answer: Correct, with the exception that the County would like to have a position budgeting solution in the proposal, from which a data file can be created to be uploaded into either OpenGov (the County's budget system) or Finance Enterprise (the County's financial accounting system).

- a. If that understanding is accurate, will the County's requirement be met by recording specific fields in FE for Projects & Grants in the Oracle Time and Labor system, with an interface back to FE either from OTL or Payroll.

Answer: The County's projects and grants are tracked using the "job ledger" fields in Finance Enterprise, and we would like to have the Finance Enterprise job ledger chart of accounts integrated into the HCM solution along with the County's general ledger chart of accounts.

Vendor #4

Question: Will the County accept electronic submission in lieu of hardcopy submission?

Answer: The County does not have a secure electronic submission option available for sealed bids at this time. A sealed bid containing a single hard copy and USB version is required.

Question: Our IT Security company policy and procedures prevents the use of external devices (i.e., thumb drives). In addition to submitting hardcopies, will you allow electronic submission via email in lieu of the thumb drive?

Answer: As we cannot receive sealed electronic bids, there is no way to receive an electronic submission via email in a "sealed" capacity at this time. We will also accept the provision of data using a CD-R formatted for data if this is allowed.

Question: Given the number of questions expected and the impact the responses will have on our submission, would it be possible to extend the submittal deadline by two weeks?

Answer: Please review the revised process schedule at the beginning of Amendment 1 for updated dates.

Question: Could you please let us know how we can obtain the addendums as the solicitation is not posted on OpenGov procurement site as this was the final project before transitioning to the platform?

Answer: The County maintains a vendor list for this solicitation based on expressed interest by vendors via email, pre-proposal conference attendance, consultant-provided contacts, and active vendors in our vendor system. This list will be used to send email copies of all addendums for this solicitation during the active procurement period. In addition, the County posts all Addendums publicly here: [Solicitations](#)

Question: Based on the budget requirements in Tab 3 of the Functional workbook, can you confirm the County is looking to replace your existing operating and capital budget development solution?

Answer: The County is only requesting a position budgeting solution. The County uses OpenGov for development of the operating and capital budget. The county wishes for a position budgeting solution from which a data file can be created to be either uploaded to OpenGov (Budget System) or Finance Enterprise (Accounting System).

Question: Does the County use OpenGov for the budget development process or is it used solely for the transparency website?

Answer: The County uses OpenGov for budget development.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 2; PG12-15: Can you provide more specificity on what you mean for overhead - is that just for benefits or are there other items you are including in overhead?

Answer: Line PG.12 – PG.14 are intended to replace WinCAMS functionality and should be “Desired”.

PG.12: WinCAMS allows labor rates to be manually edited, based on security, for billing purposes. SEE PG. 14.

PG.13: WinCAMS allows time and equipment to be coded to projects in time entry by the employee. This should be listed as “Desired”.

PG.14: WinCAMS allows labor rates different than the employees’ rate of pay to be charged to a project/grant for billing purposes.

PG.15: Employee salaries and additional time entry hours may be coded to multiple GL and project/grant codes. The system can charge an overhead rate, based on the employee’s pay allocation in each pay period (i.e., charging each GL or project/grant paid a specific percentage to the overhead rate to pay for payroll staff, benefits, or employee’s accruals).

Question: RE: Functional Tab 2; PG25: Can you provide more specificity on "reimbursement"? Is it your intent to track grant revenue reimbursements in this solution or will that be handled by your current financials solution?

Answer: Grant revenue will be tracked in the County’s current financial solution.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 2; PG27-28: Is it the County's assumption that this solution will be the source for grant information like allowable cost and effective dates, or will that information be available from your financial solution?

Answer: These should remain “Critical” to remove any manual processes.

PG.27: The system can allocate payroll costs for benefits in each payroll appropriately, based on hours worked and the defined allowed expense charges to projects and grants, when payroll is processed.

PG.28: The system can turn off the ability to charge to a project/grant when the end date has passed, or the project/grant has been closed. (This would only need the grant dates, or a grant on/off loaded on the HCM side.)

Question: RE: Functional Tab 2; PG 31, 36, 37: Can you provide more specificity on this requirement? Typically budget to actual comparisons and tracking of allowable costs are done in the financials solution. Are you asking us to provide a solution for financial reporting and grant compliance?

Answer: PG.31: This should be removed. Budget will not be loaded into the HCM system.

PG.36: This should be removed. Budget will not be loaded into the HCM system. This should remain "Critical" for Salary & Benefit Projections.

PG.37: The County can remove the "actual budget" from the line since it would not be loaded into HCM. The County will, however, keep the "estimated actual" and "actual cost" for salary & benefit projections. The salary & benefit information would come from the actual payroll data that was processed in the HCM system up to a specific date. Users could project out the estimated actual to the end of the current year from the current data. It could all be exported into Excel if needed.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 7; HRB.227: This Requirement indicates an integration of a worker document from the ERP to Laserfiche, however Laserfiche is not listed on the Interfaces Tab (10). Could the County please clarify the need for a Document Management System?

Answer: Currently, the County does not interface from its HCM system to Laserfiche. The County is open to a solution that may integrate to Laserfiche or an alternative document management solution. Laserfiche is the County's current document management solution.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 6; LP.16-17: Does the County wish to have specific third party content accessible through the LMS, specifically NeoGov, Relias, SumTotal, and KnowB4? Will the County continue the relationships with these LMS vendors or plan to replace these systems?

Answer: The County is open to evaluating the replacement of all listed systems except for KnowB4.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 10; INT.4: Does the County wish to replace the in-house Performance system? If so, would the County intend to sunset the in-house system and retire this integration once a new Performance system is in place?

Answer: The County is open to evaluating the replacement of the in-house Performance system.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 10; INT.7: Does the County intend to keep the JobAps system in addition to an ERP-based Recruiting Solution? Are there additional Job Boards the County wishes to post jobs on (i.e., LinkedIn, Monster, etc.)?

Answer: The County intends to keep JobAps as the primary applicant tracking system, but the County is open to evaluating a replacement system. The County evaluates placing jobs on various job boards on an ongoing basis based on the recruitment that is being conducted.

Question: RE: Functional Tab 10; INT.27: Please confirm which services are provided by BCC, i.e. ACA Compliance, COBRA Administration, Claims Processing, Retiree Billing, etc.

Answer: COBRA administration for dental and vision, and dental and vision for active employees.

Question: Would the County allow for integration or any other more technically-related work to be performed offshore?

Answer: Section 4.11 is part of the standard terms and conditions. If the vendor wishes to request changes to these terms and conditions, this would need to be negotiated between the County and the vendor, and an exemption would need to be approved by the Board of Supervisors. In order to have the Board of Supervisors approve an exception to offshore outsourcing of services, a strong justification would need to accompany any request for exemption.

Vendor #5

Question: AST would respectfully like to request a 2 week extension for the deadline of submittal of the RFP# 23P3-001 Software & Implementation of HCM.

Answer: Please review the revised process schedule at the beginning of Amendment 1 for updated dates.

Vendor #6

Question: Could the County please provide additional details around the current grants process?

Answer: Currently, the County uses Job Ledger (JL) keys in Finance Enterprise to track grant-related revenues and expenditures. These JL keys are also available for use in the County's e-timecard system (i.e. the employee can assign a grant's JL key to their hours in e-timecard). When payroll is processed each pay period, the salaries and benefits related to the hours coded to the grant's JL key post to the general ledger with the JL key.

Question: Would the County consider extending the due date for the RFP response by a couple weeks?

Answer: Please review the revised process schedule at the beginning of Amendment 1 for updated dates.

All other information remains the same.

10/06/2023 was the deadline for all questions regarding this RFP. No further questions will be accepted by Purchasing.

RFP SUBMITTAL DEADLINE HAS CHANGED.

RFP DUE:

Friday, December 01, 2023 by 5:00 PM Pacific Time

In the Purchasing Division of General Services
701 Ocean Street, Room 330
Santa Cruz, CA 95060



Shauna Soldate
Shauna.Soldate@santacruzcounty.us

10/10/2023
Date